UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,131	02/05/2002	Tana Netsch	004754.P013	1405

919   7590   06/30/2005

PITNEY BOWES INC.
35 WATERVIEW DRIVE
P.O. BOX 3000
MSC 26-22
SHELTON, CT 06484-8000

EXAMINER
HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/072,131	NETSCH, TANA
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Doug Hutton	2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 November 2002</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) <u>26</u> is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-7,9-20,22-25,27 and 28</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) <u>8 and 21</u> is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 February 2002</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20021113</u>.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 8 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- for each of these claims, the phrase beginning with the term "calculating" (see Claim 8, Line 2) should be indented to begin a new paragraph, so that the elements in the body of each claim are more easily distinguished from the preamble.

Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase beginning with the term "calculating" (Line 3) should be indented to begin a new paragraph, so that the elements in the body of each claim are more easily distinguished from the preamble; also, the phrase beginning with the term "determining" (Line 4) should be indented to begin a new paragraph because it describes a separate element of the invention.

Claim 26 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the phrase beginning with the term "means for determining" (Lines 2-3) because it describes a separate element of the invention.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 28:

The language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 28 recites a "computer readable medium" (see Line 1) that comprises "waves" and "signals" (see *Specification* – Page 8, Paragraph 0016). Thus, the "computer readable medium" recited in Claim 28 is neither "concrete" nor "tangible."

Stated differently, Claim 28 is not limited to *tangible* embodiments. In view of Applicant's disclosure (see *Specification* – Page 8, Paragraph 0016), the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g., magnetic disk storage media) and intangible embodiments (e.g., carrier waves, infrared signals and digital signals). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by inserting the term "tangible" between the terms "A" and "computer" in Line 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Lemay, Laura, **Sams Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 in 21 Days**

(Sams Publishing, © 2000).

Claim 1:

Lemay discloses a method, comprising:

- receiving data pertaining to a user request for content (see Pages 360-387 –

  Lemay discloses this limitation in that it expressly teaches a web publisher

  creating web pages having frames. This teaching implies a client user accessing

  a created web page by typing in the URL for the web page. When the user

  accesses the web page, the client computer "receives data pertaining to a user

  request for content.");

- determining that the requested content cannot be displayed in a browser window

  using a single page (see Pages 360-387 – Lemay discloses this limitation in that,

  upon accessing the web page having frames, the client computer executes the

  frameset document and "determines that the requested content cannot be

  displayed in a browser window using a single page." The web page having

  frames cannot be displayed in the browser window "using a single page" in that

the frameset document comprises a number of separate HTML documents, all of

which will be displayed in the frameset document.); and

- generating code which, when executed, causes a display of the requested

  content to be divided into a plurality of frames displaying corresponding portions

  of the requested content in the browser window, the plurality of frames appearing

  to a user as a single page containing the requested content (see Pages 360-387

  – Lemay discloses this limitation in that the web publisher writes the frameset

  document, which includes the HTML code that describes the layout of each

  frame. The frameset document also includes the HTML documents that appear

  in each of the frames. The frameset document and the corresponding HTML

  documents that fill in each of the frames are displayed as a single page.).

Claim 2:

Lemay discloses the method of Claim 1 wherein the code is presented in the

form of a markup language document identifying the plurality of frames associated with

child markup language documents (see Pages 360-387 – Lemay discloses this

limitation in that it teaches an HTML frameset document that defines the layout of the

frames and identifies that HTML documents that appear in the frames.).

Claim 3:

Lemay discloses the method of Claim 1 wherein each of the plurality of frames

has invisible borders and is positioned immediately after a preceding frame (see Pages

360-387 – Lemay discloses this limitation in that it teaches the frame borders can be turned off and the frames can be arranged in various configurations using the "cols" and "rows" attributes.).

Claim 4:

Lemay discloses the method of Claim 1 wherein each of the plurality of frames is associated in the code with a set of parameters that cause said each of the plurality of frames to request the corresponding portion of the requested content from a content source during the execution of the code (see Pages 360-387 – Lemay discloses this limitation in that it teaches an HTML frameset document that defines the layout of the frames and identifies that HTML documents that appear in the frames.).

Claim 5:

Lemay discloses the method of Claim 4 wherein the plurality of frames request corresponding portions of the requested content in parallel (see Pages 360-387 – Lemay discloses this limitation in that it teaches an HTML frameset document that simultaneously obtains the HTML documents that appear in the frames.).

Claim 6:

Lemay discloses the method of Claim 1 wherein each of the plurality of frames in the code includes instructions that cause the plurality of frames to operate as a single page in response to user interaction with the displayed content (see Pages 360-387 –

Lemay discloses this limitation in that it teaches creating a complex HTML frameset that provides a navigation bar that helps a user navigate through a website much more easily. For example, a navigation bar may be placed in the left frame of the browser window and, each time the user clicks a link in the navigation frame, another frame will display the page that the user has selected.).

Claim 7:

Lemay discloses the method of Claim 1 wherein the data pertaining to the user request is a query execution plan (The examiner interprets "query execution plan" to mean *"the steps to retrieve and view the requested content,"* as specified in the Specification on Page 13, first partial paragraph. In Lemay, see Pages 360-387 – Lemay discloses this limitation in that it teaches creating an HTML frameset defines the layout of the frames and identifies that HTML documents that appear in the frames.).

Claim 9:

Lemay discloses the method of Claim 1 further comprising:

- calculating the number of frames required to display the requested content (see Pages 360-387 – Lemay discloses this limitation in that it teaches an HTML frameset defines the number of frames in the page.).

Claim 10:

Lemay discloses the method of Claim 9 wherein the number of frames depends on a layout of the display of the requested content (see Pages 360-387 – Lemay discloses this limitation in that it teaches an HTML frameset defines the number of frames in the page.).

Claim 11:

Lemay discloses the method of Claim 10 wherein:

- the layout includes a set of columns (see Pages 360-387 – Lemay discloses this limitation in that it teaches the frames in an HTML frameset can be arranged in various configurations using the "cols" attribute.); and

- each of the plurality of frames is designated to display data in a particular column within the set of columns (see Pages 360-387 – Lemay discloses this limitation in that it teaches an HTML frameset document that defines the layout of the frames and identifies that HTML documents that appear in the frames.).

Claim 12:

Lemay discloses the method of Claim 1 wherein each of the plurality of frames is an inline frame (see Pages 360-387 – Lemay discloses this limitation in that it teaches "floating" frames, which are also known as "inline" frames.).

Claim 13:

Lemay discloses the method of Claim 1 further comprising:

sending the code to a client device for execution (see Pages 360-387 – Lemay

discloses this limitation in that it teaches a user navigating, via a browser, to a web page

having frames, wherein the browser at the client computer executes the code to display

the web page.).

Claims 14, 15, 17-20, 22-24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by www.ewita.com/EWITA%20Tools/ptrv/menu/frameset.html , as published

on 7 November 1999 (hereinafter, EWITA).

Claim 14:

EWITA discloses an apparatus, comprising:

- a user request processor to receive data pertaining to a user request for content

  (see Pages 1-5 of 5 – EWITA discloses this limitation in that it expressly teaches

  creating web pages having dynamically-created framesets. This teaching implies

  a client user accessing a created web page by typing in the URL for the web

  page. When the user accesses the web page, the client computer processor

  "receives data pertaining to a user request for content.") and to determine that

  the requested content cannot be displayed in a browser window using a single

  page (see Pages 1-5 of 5 – EWITA discloses this limitation in that it expressly

  teaches determining whether the client user's browser is JavaScript-enabled,

and, depending upon that determination, either dynamically creating a frameset

or using the regular HTML document. When the browser is determined to be

JavaScript-enabled, the frameset is dynamically created and the web page is

displayed using frames; thus, it is determined that the web page "cannot be

displayed in a browser window using a single page" whenever the client user's

browser is JavaScript-enabled.); and

- a code generator code which, when executed, causes a display of the requested

  content to be divided into a plurality of frames displaying corresponding portions

  of the requested content in the browser window, the plurality of frames appearing

  to a user as a single page containing the requested content (see Pages 1-5 of 5

  – EWITA discloses this limitation in that it teaches web pages having

  dynamically-created framesets. The frameset is created on-the-fly, thereby

  overriding the HTML in the requested web page. The dynamically-created

  frameset document includes the HTML code that describes the layout of the

  frames and the HTML documents that appear in each of the frames. The

  frameset document and the corresponding HTML documents that fill in each of

  the frames are displayed as a single page.).

Claim 15:

EWITA discloses the apparatus of Claim 14 wherein the code is presented in the

form of a markup language document identifying the plurality of frames associated with

child markup language documents (see Pages 1-5 of 5 – EWITA discloses this limitation

in that it teaches an HTML frameset document that defines the layout of the frames and

identifies that HTML documents that appear in the frames.).

Claim 17:

EWITA discloses the apparatus of Claim 14 wherein each of the plurality of

frames is associated in the code with a set of parameters that cause said each of the

plurality of frames to request the corresponding portion of the requested content from a

content source during the execution of the code (see Pages 1-5 of 5 – EWITA discloses

this limitation in that it teaches an HTML frameset document that defines the layout of

the frames and identifies that HTML documents that appear in the frames.).

Claim 18:

Lemay discloses the apparatus of Claim 17 wherein the plurality of frames

request corresponding portions of the requested content in parallel (see Pages 1-5 of 5

– EWITA discloses this limitation in that it teaches an HTML frameset document that

simultaneously obtains the HTML documents that appear in the frames.).

Claim 19:

EWITA discloses the apparatus of Claim 14 wherein each of the plurality of

frames in the code includes instructions that cause the plurality of frames to operate as

a single page in response to user interaction with the displayed content (see Pages 1-5

of 5 – EWITA discloses this limitation in that it teaches creating a complex HTML

frameset that provides a menu in one of the frames, so that a user can navigate through the website much more easily. For example, each time the user clicks a link in the menu, another frame will display the page that the user has selected.).

Claim 20:

EWITA discloses the apparatus of Claim 14 wherein the data pertaining to the user request is a query execution plan (The examiner interprets "query execution plan" to mean *"the steps to retrieve and view the requested content,"* as specified in the Specification on Page 13, first partial paragraph. In EWITA, see Pages 1-5 of 5 – EWITA discloses this limitation in that it teaches creating an HTML frameset defines the layout of the frames and identifies that HTML documents that appear in the frames.).

Claim 22:

EWITA discloses the apparatus of Claim 14 wherein the code generator is further to calculate the number of frames required to display the requested content (see Pages 1-5 of 5 – EWITA discloses this limitation in that it teaches an HTML frameset defines the number of frames in the page.).

Claim 23:

EWITA discloses the apparatus of Claim 22 wherein the number of frames depends on a layout of the display of the requested content (see Pages 1-5 of 5 –

EWITA discloses this limitation in that it teaches an HTML frameset defines the number

of frames in the page.).

Claim 24:

EWITA discloses the apparatus of Claim 23 wherein:

- the layout includes a set of columns (see Pages 1-5 of 5 – EWITA discloses this

    limitation in that it teaches an HTML frameset that has two columns.); and

- each of the plurality of frames is designated to display data in a particular column

    within the set of columns (see Pages 1-5 of 5 – EWITA discloses this limitation in

    that it teaches an HTML frameset document that defines the layout of the frames

    and identifies that HTML documents that appear in the frames.).

Claim 28:

EWITA discloses a computer-readable medium comprising executable

instructions which when executed on a processing system cause said processing

system to perform a method comprising:

- receiving data pertaining to a user request for content from a client device (see

    Pages 1-5 of 5 – EWITA discloses this limitation in that it expressly teaches

    creating web pages having dynamically-created framesets. This teaching implies

    a client user accessing a created web page by typing in the URL for the web

    page. When the user accesses the web page, the client computer processor

    "receives data pertaining to a user request for content.");

- determining that the requested content cannot be displayed in a browser window using a single page (see Pages 1-5 of 5 – EWITA discloses this limitation in that it expressly teaches determining whether the client user's browser is JavaScript-enabled, and, depending upon that determination, either dynamically creating a frameset or using the regular HTML document. When the browser is determined to be JavaScript-enabled, the frameset is dynamically created and the web page is displayed using frames; thus, it is determined that the web page "cannot be displayed in a browser window using a single page" whenever the client user's browser is JavaScript-enabled.); and

- generating a script which, when executed, causes a display of the requested content to be divided into a plurality of frames displaying corresponding portions of the requested content in the browser window, the plurality of frames appearing to a user as a single page containing the requested content (see Pages 1-5 of 5 – EWITA discloses this limitation in that it teaches web pages having dynamically-created framesets. The frameset is created on-the-fly, thereby overriding the HTML in the requested web page. The dynamically-created frameset document includes the HTML code that describes the layout of the frames and the HTML documents that appear in each of the frames. The frameset document and the corresponding HTML documents that fill in each of the frames are displayed as a single page.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over EWITA.

Claim 16:

As indicated in the above rejection, EWITA discloses every limitation of Claim 14.

EWITA fails to expressly disclose each of a plurality of frames that have invisible

borders and are positioned immediately after a preceding frame.

However, the examiner takes **Official Notice** that, in a frameset, frames having

invisible borders was conventional and well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art

(e.g., a web page designer) at the time the invention was made. Also, the examiner

takes **Official Notice** that, in a frameset, frames that are positioned immediately after a

preceding frame was conventional and well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made. Each of these actions was performed using well-

known programming techniques in the field of web page design and would have been

taken by the web page designer for the purpose of making the web page more attractive

to computer users.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify the frames, disclosed in EWITA, so that each

of the frames have invisible borders and are positioned immediately after a preceding

frame, for the purpose of making the web page more attractive to computer users.

Claim 27:

EWITA discloses a system, comprising:

- a client computer to receive a user request for content (see Pages 1-5 of 5 –

  EWITA discloses this limitation in that it expressly teaches creating web pages

  having dynamically-created framesets. This teaching implies a client user

  accessing a created web page by typing in the URL for the web page. When the

  user accesses the web page, the client computer processor "receives a user

  request for content.");

- a server, coupled to the client computer over a network, to generate a markup

  language document according to the user request for content and to send the

  markup language document to the client computer for display (see Pages 1-5 of

  5 – EWITA discloses this limitation in that it expressly teaches creating web

  pages having dynamically-created framesets. This teaching implies a server

  connected to a client computer via the Internet. The frameset is created on-the-

  fly, thereby overriding the HTML in the requested web page. The server

  generates and sends the requested web page to the client computer for display.),

  the markup language document being displayed as a plurality of frames (see

  Pages 1-5 of 5 – EWITA discloses this limitation in that the dynamically-created

  frameset document includes multiple frames.), such that the requested content

appears to be displayed as a single page (see Pages 1-5 of 5 – EWITA discloses this limitation in that the frameset document and the corresponding HTML documents that fill in each of the frames are displayed as a single page.).

EWITA fails to expressly disclose a plurality of frames that have invisible borders. However, the examiner takes **Official Notice** that, in a frameset, frames having invisible borders was conventional and well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art (e.g., a web page designer) at the time the invention was made. This action was performed using well-known programming techniques in the field of web page design and would have been taken by the web page designer for the purpose of making the web page more attractive to computer users.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the frames, disclosed in EWITA, so that the frames have invisible borders, for the purpose of making the web page more attractive to computer users.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EWITA, in view of Lemay.

Claim 25:

As indicated in the above rejection, EWITA discloses every limitation of Claim 14.

EWITA fails to expressly disclose each of a plurality of frames that is an inline frame.

Lemay teaches a plurality of frames, wherein each of the plurality of frames is an inline frame (see Pages 360-387 – Lemay discloses this limitation in that it teaches "floating" frames, which are also known as "inline" frames.), for the purpose of positioning a floating frame anywhere on a web page.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify each frame, disclosed in EWITA, to be an inline frame, for the purpose of positioning a floating frame anywhere on a web page, as taught by Lemay.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 26 is allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claim 26:

The closest prior art is Lemay and EWITA.

Lemay discloses HTML framesets and the various options for an HTML frameset that are available to a web page designer. These options include designing the layout of the frameset document, which comprises setting the number of frames, locating and sizing those frames and filling in those frames with HTML documents. Other options include turning off frame borders and setting the colors for frame borders.

EWITA discloses dynamically generating HTML framesets. Whether an HTML frameset is generated depends upon whether the user's browser is JavaScript-enabled. If the user's browser is JavaScript-enabled, then the HTML frameset is dynamically generated and replaces the original HTML code in the web page. Otherwise, the browser simply displays the web page according to the original HTML code.

The prior art fails to disclose or suggest an apparatus for dynamically generating an HTML frameset that comprises a *"means for"* determining that the requested web page cannot be displayed in the browser window using a single page (The examiner interprets *"cannot be displayed in the browser window using a single page"* to mean: 1) the amount of displayable data in the web page is too large for the entire page to be viewable on a computer display screen without scrolling; or 2) the amount of data in the web page is so large that the performance of the browser starts deteriorating. See Specification – Pages 8-9, Paragraph 0018.), wherein the determination includes:

- counting the number of formatting elements needed for displaying the web page using a single page; and

- determining that the number of formatting elements exceeds a predetermined threshold.

Accordingly, Claim 26 is distinguished from the prior art and allowable.

Claims 8 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claims 8 and 21:

The closest prior art is Lemay and EWITA.

Lemay discloses HTML framesets and the various options for an HTML frameset that are available to a web page designer. These options include designing the layout of the frameset document, which comprises setting the number of frames, locating and sizing those frames and filling in those frames with HTML documents. Other options include turning off frame borders and setting the colors for frame borders.

EWITA discloses dynamically generating HTML framesets. Whether an HTML frameset is generated depends upon whether the user's browser is JavaScript-enabled. If the user's browser is JavaScript-enabled, then the HTML frameset is dynamically generated and replaces the original HTML code in the web page. Otherwise, the browser simply displays the web page according to the original HTML code.

The prior art fails to disclose or suggest a method/apparatus for dynamically generating an HTML frameset based upon a determination that the requested web page cannot be displayed in the browser window using a single page (The examiner interprets "*cannot be displayed in the browser window using a single page*" to mean: 1) the amount of displayable data in the web page is too large for the entire page to be

viewable on a computer display screen without scrolling; or 2) the amount of data in the

web page is so large that the performance of the browser starts deteriorating. See

Specification – Pages 8-9, Paragraph 0018.), wherein the determination comprises:

- counting the number of formatting elements needed for displaying the web page

  using a single page; and

- determining that the number of formatting elements exceeds a predetermined

  threshold.

Accordingly, Claims 8 and 21 are distinguished from the prior art and allowable.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure: Adams et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,237,030; DeRose et al., U.S.

Patent No. 5,893,109; Kuppusamy et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,769,096; Gamon, U.S.

Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0054126; Savage, U.S. Patent Application

Publication No. US 2004/0054968; www.javaworld.com/javaworld/jw-11-2001/jw-1130-

jscroll .html, as published on 30 November 2001; www.w3.org/TR/WD-frames-970331,

as published on 31 March 1997; and www10.org/cdrom/papers/594/, as published on 5

May 2001.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH
June 23, 2005

DOUG HUTTON
PATENT EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100